



5450 Complex Street, # 307  
San Diego, CA 92123  
Phone: 858-571-0475,  
Fax: 858-764-2756

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

August 04, 2006

Re: Office Action dated June 05, 2006; US Patent Application 10/809,977 filed 03/26/2004,  
Examiner Zachary M. Pape.

The following is our reply to the Final Office Action dated 06/05/2006.

We can not agree with the Examiner's Claim Rejections under 35USC §103 (a) in view of the new ground of rejection and would like to request continued examination of the application by filing a submission and the fee set forth in § 1.17(e).

1. CLAIMS REJECTIONS - The Claims Rejections under 35USC §103 (a) made by the Examiner according to the Final Office Action dated 06/05/2006 based on the statement that: "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Smith with that of Chen et al. to provide an efficient and quiet blower to the device of Chen et al."

But, Chen et al. teaches a cooler when cooling air flows through the first heatsink, the axial fan and the second heatsink in a series way in contrast to our patent application where cooling air flows through both heatsinks at the same time and only after that flows through the double inlet centrifugal blower. Smith does not teach at all to use a double inlet centrifugal blower in electronic cooling. It is evident that combining of the teachings of Smith with that of Chen et al. will place air- and thermo- dynamics schemes of such device in contradiction with the mentioned above Chen's teachings.

Additionally, the double inlet centrifugal blower according to Smith comprises an electric drive (60) placed aside of the casing (See Figs. 6 and 8 of Smith). But, according to Chen et al. the electric drive is placed inside the axial fan, therefore, it is impossible to combine the teachings of Smith with that of Chen et al. at the same volume because there is no space available for Smith's electric drive placement in Chen et al. design.

According to our patent application (see Specification and Drawings), the double inlet centrifugal blower comprises a flat electric drive that resolved the contradiction of the electric drive placement between Smith and Chen et al. designs. Therefore, based on our Specification and Drawings we would like to specify such flat electric drive more clearly by making an amendment in Claim 1 and add new Claim 8. No new matter was entered.

2. DRAWINGS. To take into consideration the Examiner's drawings objection "the electronic component of claim 1 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)" we would like to make an amendment in the claim 1 (see attached Claims Listing). No new matter was entered.

We would like to ask you for further consideration of our Patent Application.

Best regards,



Edward Lopatinsky  
Vice-President

Enclosed:

1. Transmittal Form (Form PTO/SB/21) - 1 pg.;
2. Request for Continued Examination (RCE) (Form PTO/SB/30) - 1 pg.;
3. Check in the amount of \$395;
4. Amendment to the Claims (Claims Listing) - 1 pg.;
5. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) (Form PTO/SB/96) - 1 pg.